

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

By the present amendment, the specification has been amended to substitute more commonly used terms for the terms presently in the application and to more clearly describe the drawing figures in the section "Brief Description of the Drawings." Fig. 1 of the drawings has been replaced with a new Fig. 1 showing schematically a tool the inventive insert can be used with. Approval of the new Fig. 1 replacement sheet, together with a letter to an Official Draftsperson being enclosed, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 have been cancelled and replaced with new claims 7-10.

Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the application is deemed to be in condition for allowance and Action to that end is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for an alleged insufficiency of the disclosure. Specifically, the Examiner pointed out that the views are not accurately described, the minimal

radius of curvature is not described in enough detail, questions the purpose of the “scallop” (Burr 7) and the criticality of the R/20.

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing amendment of the section “Brief Description of the Drawings” overcomes the Examiner’s objections to the drawing description.

Further, the minimal radius of the curvature in the transition zone X’ is the same as in the transition zone X, as it is described in the specification (page 4, last three lines, page 5, line 1). The minimal radius R/20 insures, as it is described in the specification (page 3, lines 9-11) that increase (superelevation) of stress as a result of point loads, and the probability of cracking in the brazing layer between the tool and the shoulder edge are reduced.

As to the burr (7), it is an unavoidable result of manufacturing of the insert by a spark-erosion process. However, its location in the central zone of the shoulder edge (4), minimally loaded zone, alleviates its adverse effect.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the specification provides sufficient support for the claimed subject matter, and it is respectfully requested that the objection to the specification and rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. As noted above, claims 1-5, together with claim 6, have been cancelled. It is respectfully submitted that the new claims 7-10 comply with all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place the case in condition for final allowance, it is respectfully requested that such amendment or correction be carried out by Examiner's Amendment and the case passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander Zinchuk
Alexander Zinchuk
Reg. No. 30,541

Dated: November 14, 2005
Abelman, Frayne & Schwab
666 Third Avenue, 10th Floor
New York, NY 10017-5621
212-885-9383



This correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on November 14, 2005 in an envelope as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label Number ER 842 053 584 US addressed to the Honorable Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Alexander Zinchuk
Alexander Zinchuk

In the Drawings:

Replace Fig. 1 with a new Fig. 1.